IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States AK. JR., CLERK

October Term, 1978

No. 78-410

LEE-HY PAVING CORP. and DAVIS E. CLEM,

Petitioners,

against

MARGUERITE T. O'CONNOR, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Daniel J. O'Connor, Deceased, Respondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR
Attorney for Petitioners
One Battery Park Plaza
New York, New York 10004
(212) 483-9000

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR
ROY L. REARDON
THOMAS M. BISTLINE
SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT
Of Counsel



Supreme Court of the United States October Term, 1978

No. 78-410

LEE-HY PAVING CORP. and DAVIS E. CLEM,

Petitioners,

against

MARGUERITE T. O'CONNOR, as Administratrix of the Goods, Chattels and Credits of Daniel J. O'Connor, Deceased,

Respondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Preliminary Statement

This supplemental brief is submitted on behalf of petitioners Lee-Hy Paving Corp. and Davis E. Clem to call to the attention of the Court two decisions rendered since the filing of the petition in this matter.

Recent Decisions Show That the Instant Petition for Certiorari Should Be Granted

On October 20, 1978 the Supreme Court of Minnesota decided Savchuk v. Rush, Docket No. 45556 (Minn., October 20, 1978). There, over the dissents of Justice Otis and two other Justices, the Minnesota Court determined to adhere to its prior ruling which approved the jurisdictional attachment of obligations arising under the liability insurance policies of non-resident defendants. By thus reaffirming a decision vacated by this Court, see Rush v. Savchuk, 433 U.S. 902 (1977), the Supreme Court of Minnesota has given its approval to the doctrine of Seider v. Roth, 17 N.Y.2d 111, 269 N.Y.S.2d 99, 216 N.E.2d 312 (1966), and has joined with New York and New Hampshire in permitting the practice against which the instant petition is directed.

The New York Court of Appeals has also spoken again on this issue, reaffirming in Baden v. Staples, Docket No. 455 (N.Y., October 24, 1978), its support for the Seider doctrine. However, as it did in both Neumann v. Dunham, 39 N.Y.2d 999, 387 N.Y.S.2d 240, 355 N.E.2d 294 (1976) and Donawitz v. Danek, 42 N.Y.2d 138, 379 N.Y.S.2d 592, 366 N.E.2d 253 (1977), the Court of Appeals upheld Seider on the narrow ground of stare decisis, observing that "it is more important that the law be settled than that it be settled 'correctly'."

It is respectfully submitted that these two decisions emphasize the importance of the Court's granting certiorari in the instant case, and providing clear guidance for state and federal courts in this troubled area. It should be noted that both Savchuk v. Rush and Baden v. Staples cite, and were certainly encouraged by, the decision of the Second Circuit in the present case. Thus, the error committed below is repeated in other courts, and the threat to the rational basis and uniform application of the law of jurisdiction is increased. If the constitutional principles of jurisdiction set forth in Shaffer v. Heitner, 433 U.S. 186 (1977), are to be applied fairly and equally across the country, this Court should act to prevent their erosion by decisions such as those reached in Minnesota and New York.

Conclusion

It is respectfully requested that the Court grant the instant petition for a writ of certiorari, summarily reverse the decision below and direct the dismissal of this action.

Respectfully submitted,

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR
Attorney for Petitioners
One Battery Park Plaza
New York, New York 10004
(212) 483-9000

WHITNEY NORTH SEYMOUR
ROY L. REARDON
THOMAS M. BISTLINE
SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT
Of Counsel